

REMARKS

This amendment responds to the office action dated October 2, 2003.

The Examiner rejected claims 20-25 and 27 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Noguchi, et al, U.S. Patent No. 6,034,677 (hereinafter Noguchi). Independent claim 20, from which dependent claims 21-25 and 27 each depend, as amended includes the limitation of displaying “at the selection of a user any selected one of the available options of (i) a first panel; (ii) a second panel; and (iii) a first panel and a second panel.” The Examiner had contended that, even though the quoted list includes the conjunctive “and”, the list should be read in the disjunctive, i.e. it would read on prior art that disclosed a system where the user could select displays from available options of only a first panel or only a second panel but where there was no option of displaying both a first panel and a second panel. Independent claim 20, as amended, makes clear that the claimed system is one where a user may display *any selected one of the available options of* a first panel, a second panel, or a first and second panel.” Because Noguchi does not disclose a system having all three recited available options, independent claim 20, as well as dependent claims 21-25 and 27 are patentably distinguished over Noguchi. The applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw his rejection of these claims.

The Examiner rejected dependent claim 26 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious in view of Noguchi, and dependent claim 28 as being obvious in view of the combination of Noguchi and Mathews III, et al. Neither of these references disclose a system having all three recited available options, hence dependent claims 26 and 28 are each patentably distinguished over Noguchi and the combination of Noguchi and Matthews III, et al., respectively. The applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw his rejection of these claims.

The Examiner rejected claims 1-5, 7, 8, and 10 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious in view of the combination of Schein, U.S. Patent No. 6,151,059 and Lemmons, et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,266,814 (hereinafter Lemmons). Independent claim 1, from which claims 2-5, 7, 8, and 10 depend, as amended, includes the limitations a “first panel displaying on said display . . . a first time, where said first time is the earliest time displayed on said display in response to said first signal; and a second time, said second time being a later time displayed on said display

in response to said first signal and a time incrementally earlier than an end of a time range associated with said first panel” and in response to selecting a second record, displaying simultaneously with said video “a second panel, said second panel having . . . an associated time range extending from a third time to a time incrementally later than a fourth time, said third and said fourth times both being times that are, respectively, one of times later than said second time and times earlier than said first time and where neither of said third and said fourth times were displayed on said first panel.

The Examiner’s rejection was based on the view that if Schein were modified by Lemmons to include a display showing a time range greater than one hour, then scrolling in the increments disclosed by both Schein and Lemmons would produce the claimed second panel. However, given this combination, scrolling in these increments would produce a second panel in which at least one of said third time or said fourth time displayed on the second panel would also have been displayed on the first panel. For that reason, independent claim 1, as well as dependent claims 2-5, 7, 8, and 10 each patentably distinguish over the cited combination. The applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of these claims.

The Examiner rejected dependent claims 6 and 9 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious in view of the combinations of Schein, Lemmons and Doherty, et al. and Schein, Lemmons, and Berezowski, respectively. Dependent claims 6 and 9 depend from independent claim 1, which as amended, includes the limitation of “displaying simultaneously with said video a second panel, said second panel having . . . an associated time range extending from a third time to a time incrementally later than a fourth time, said third and said fourth times both being times that are, respectively, one of times later than said second time and times earlier than said first time and where neither of said third and said fourth times were displayed on said first panel.” Neither of the combinations cited by the Examiner disclose this limitation. The applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of these claims.

///

///

///

///

///

///

In view of the foregoing amendment and remarks, reconsideration and allowance of claims 21-40 is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Kurt Rohlf', with a long, sweeping horizontal stroke extending to the right.

Kurt Rohlf
Registration No. 54,405
Attorney for Applicants